



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/539,266	03/30/2000	Vipin Samar	OR99-17401	8991

51067 7590 01/11/2008
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95618-7759

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/539,266

Applicant(s)

SAMAR, VIPIN

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DC

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 33 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramson et al. (6539494) (hereinafter Abramson) in view of Sandhu et al. (6985953) (hereinafter Sandhu) in further view of RFC 1321.**

4. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Abramson teaches a method for sharing secure communication session, the method comprising:

5. establishing the secure communication session between a client and a second server, wherein the secure communication session is associated with a session identifier, (e.g., col. 5, lines 31 – 63),

6. receiving a first message from the client at a first server, wherein the first message includes the session identifier, wherein the client, the first server, the second server, and the database are different from one another, (e.g., col. 6, lines 24 – 67);

7. retrieving the session identifier by the first server from the database using the session identifier, (e.g., col. 6, lines 24 – 67); and
8. using the session identifier to send a second message from the first server to the client through the secure communication session without establishing a separate secure communication session between the client and the first server, (e.g., col. 6, lines 15 – 33, “*while preserving session IDs and session data*”). Abramson does not specifically teach the second server publishes updates to the running message digest to a database, and wherein the running message digest is associated with the session identifier on the database;
9. wherein the second server continually changes a running message digest as messages are sent through the secure communication session,
10. retrieving the running message digest by the first server from the database using the session identifier; and
11. using the running message digest to send a second message from the first server to the client through the secure communication session between the client and the first server
12. Sandhu teaches the second server publishes updates to the running message digest to a database, and wherein the running message digest is associated with the session identifier on the database, (e.g., col. 9, lines 11 - 40, Message digest algorithm MD5 used in cookies, col. 12, lines 25 - 52, storing cookies in the database which has embedded in it the message digest);
13. retrieving the running message digest by the first server from the database using the session identifier, (e.g., col. 9, lines 11 – 40 & col. 12, lines 25 - 52); and
14. using the running message digest to send a second message from the first server to the client through the secure communication session between the client and the first server, (e.g., col.

9, lines 11 – 40 & col. 12, lines 25 - 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sandhu with Abramson because utilizing a running message digest allows for a different string to be produced every time the algorithm is run, therefore, giving more security to a system and having less of a opportunity for intruders to duplicate the message. Although, Sandhu does not specifically teach the second server continually changes a running message digest as messages are sent through the secure communication session, Sandhu teaches MD5. As seen in RFC 1321, MD5 is a running message digest that is always changing and therefore RFC 1321 teaches continually changes a running message digest as messages are sent through the secure communication session, (e.g., pages 1 – 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize MD5 for secure communication because it is conjectured that it is computationally infeasible to produce two messages having the same message digest, or to produce any message having a given pre-specified target message digest.

15. As per claim 10, Abramson does not teach retrieving the running message digest includes authenticating and authorizing the first server.

16. Sandhu teaches retrieving the state information includes authenticating and authorizing the first server, (e.g., col. 9, lines 11 – 40 & col. 12, lines 25 - 52). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sandhu with Abramson because it would make a system more secure if the receiver of the information could be authorized to the information by authenticating the information that was sent from the first server and for similar reasons stated above

17. The teachings for claims 13, 22, 25 and 33 can be found in the same areas as stated in the above claims and therefore are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 13, 22, 25 and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:
09/539,266
Art Unit: 2143

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-3000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE



571-272-3000 NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER